REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 21, 2006 has been received and considered. In this response, claims31, 32, 34, 35, 37-40, 43, 44, 50 and 52 have been amended, claims 30, 41, 42 and 51 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claim 53 has been added. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present

Disqualification of Ducharme as Prior Art Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c)

Submitted herewith is a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 showing that the present application, Ducharme (U.S. Patent Application No. 09/946,912), and Ducharme's parent application (U.S. Patent Application No. 09/864,524) all were under duty of assignment to the same entity, namely ViXS Systems, Inc., at their respective times of invention. Accordingly, Ducharme and its parent application are disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) for purposes of § 103 rejections.

Anticipation Rejection of Claims 13, 30 and 44

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 13, 30 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ducharme (U. S. Patent Application No. 2002/0178278). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As an initial issue, it is noted that the present application has a filing date prior to the filing date of Ducharme. Thus, in order for Ducharme to qualify as prior art under § 102(e), the Office must show that the application to which Ducharme claims priority, namely U.S. Patent Application No. 09/864,524 (hereinafter, the "Ducharme priority application"), discloses the same subject matter of Ducharme on which the Office relies. However, no such showing is attempted in the Office Action. In fact, it is noted that Figure 1 of Ducharme on which the Office relies is not present in the Ducharme priority application. It therefore is respectfully submitted that the Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claims 13, 30, and 44 in view of Ducharme. Further, it is respectfully submitted that neither Ducharme nor the Ducharme priority application discloses each and every feature of claims 13, 30, and 44.

Claim 13 recites the features of "an integrated single chip system comprising: a first processor to receive digital video data and provide parsed video data; and a second processor coupled to the first processor to access the parsed video data, the second processor including a video transcoder." The Office Action asserts that element 28 ("stream parsing module 28") of FIG. 1 of Ducharme represents the claimed "first processor" feature and further that element 30 ("transcoding module 30") of FIG. 1 of Ducharme represents the claimed "second processor" feature. The Applicants respectfully disagree. It is respectfully submitted that the Office's interpretation of the stream parsing module 28 and the transcoding module 30 of Ducharme as two separate processors is suggested solely by the present application. Nowhere does Ducharme disclose that the stream parsing module 28 and the transcoding module 30 each are implemented as a separate processor. The Ducharme priority application likewise fails to disclose or suggest that a stream parsing module and a transcoding module are implemented as two separate processors. It further is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that a stream parser module and the corresponding transcoder module conventionally are implemented together as a single processor. Accordingly, as Ducharme fails to disclose a first processor that parses video data and a second processor that includes a transcoder and that accesses the parsed video data, Ducharme necessarily fails to disclose at least the claimed features of "a first processor to receive digital video data and to provide parsed video data" and "a second processor coupled to the first processor to access the parsed video data, the second processor including a video transcoder" as recited by claim 13. Ducharme therefore fails to disclose each and every feature recited by claim 13.

Independent claim 30 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby obviating its rejection.

Independent claim 44 has been amended to recite the additional features of dependent claim 51 (now canceled). The Office Action does not assert that Ducharme discloses the features recited by claim 51, nor in fact are these features disclosed by claim 44.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 13, 30, and 44 is respectfully requested.

U.S. App. No.: 09/918,380

Anticipation Rejection of Claims 30-35 and 37-52

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 30-35 and 37-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Liu (EP 0889650 A2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 30 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and dependent claims 31-39 have been amended to depend from new claim 53. New claim 53 recites features previously presented by claims 30, 41 and 42. Accordingly, claim 53 recites the features of:

> receiving, at a first processor, a data stream including video data;
>
> parsing, at the first processor, the data stream to identify video data associated with a first channel;
>
> packetizing, at the first processor, the video data associated with the first channel to generate the one or more packets, each packet having a video data payload and information related to the video data payload, wherein the video data payloads of the one or more packets represent a first channel of compressed video data having a characteristics represented by a first value;
>
> receiving, at a second processor, the one or more packets; and
>
> transcoding, at the second processor, the video data payloads of the one or more packets to generate a representation of a second channel of compressed video data having the characteristic represented by a second value.

The Office Action asserts that element 114 (layered decoder 114) of FIG. 2 of Liu represents the first processor at which the claimed receiving, parsing, and packetizing steps are performed, and further that element 124 (layered encoder 124) represents the second processor at which the claimed receiving and transcoding steps are performed. *Office Action*, p. 5. The Applicants respectfully disagree. It is respectfully submitted that the Office's interpretation of the layered decoder 114 and the layered encoder 124 of Liu as two separate processors is suggested solely by the present application. Nowhere does Liu disclose that the layered decoder 114 is implemented in a processor separate from a processor implementing the layered encoder 124. Accordingly, as Liu fails to disclose a first processor that parses and packetizes video data and a second processor that includes a transcoder and that accesses the parsed and packetized video data, Liu necessarily fails to disclose at least the claimed features of "parsing, at the first

processor, the data stream to identify video data associated with a first channel;" "packetizing, at the first processor, the video data associated with the first channel to generate the one or more packets," and "transcoding, at the second processor, the video data payloads of the one or more packets to generate a representation of a second channel of compressed video data having the characteristic represented by a second value" as recited by claim 53. Liu therefore fails to disclose each and every feature recited by claim 53, as well as claims 31-35 and 37-39 at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 53.

Independent claim 44 has been amended to recite the additional features of dependent claim 50 (now canceled). Claim 44 presently recites the features of:

a first data processor to:

  receive one or more packets having a video data payload and information related to the video data payload, wherein the video data payloads of the one or more packets represent a first channel of compressed video data having a characteristic represented by a first value; and

  transcode the video data payloads of the one or more packets to generate a representation of a second channel of compressed video data having the characteristic represented by a second value; and

a second data processor operably coupled to the first data processor, the second data processor to:

  receive a data stream including video data at a first data processor;

  parse the data stream to identify video data associated with a first channel;

  packetize the video data associated with the first channel to generate the one or more packets; and

  provide the one or more packets for reception by the first processor.

As discussed above with respect to claim 53, Liu fails to disclose or suggest one data processor to parse and packetize video data and a separate processor to transcode the parsed and packetized video data. Liu therefore fails to disclose or suggest the claimed first data processor feature and the claimed second data processor feature recited by claims 44. Liu therefore fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44, as well as the additional features of

claims 45-50 and 52 at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 44. Moreover, these dependent claims recite additional novel features.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the anticipation rejection of claims 30-35 and 37-52 is improper at this time. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 13-29

At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 13-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (U.S. Patent Application No. 6,167,084), in view of Ducharme. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, Ducharme is disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), thereby obviating the combination of Wang and Ducharme proposed by the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claim 36

At page 7 of the Office Action, claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 36 presently depends from claim 53. As discussed above, Liu fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 53, so Liu necessarily fails to disclose or suggest the additional features of claim 36 at least by virtue of this dependency. Moreover, claim 36 recites additional novel features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan S. Davidson/   November 14, 2006
Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596   Date
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 W. Courtyard Dr., Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)